DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 444 FL 010 938

AUTHOR Durio, Helen F.; Kildow, Cheryl A.
TITLE Video, Audio, and Reading Instructional Presentations of Six French Language Scripts: An Evaluation of a Listening Comprehension Study.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Measurement and Evaluation Center.
REPORT NO SR-79-5
PUB DATE May 79
NOTE 55p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Audiotape Recordings; *Audiovisual Instruction; *College Second Language Programs; *French; Higher Education; Language Research; *Listening Comprehension; Self Esteem; Written Language

ABSTRACT

Listening comprehension of six French language scripts was tested using three types of instructional presentations and two sequenced exposures. The three presentation modes were: (1) video (a combination of audio and visual presentation of the script materials by a native speaker of French), (2) audio (a taped recording of the script materials by a native French speaker), and (3) reading (the presentation of the written script only). The criterion measure of achievement was listening comprehension skill as demonstrated on the College Placement Test of French Listening Comprehension, a standardized achievement test using tapes appropriate for students with two to four years of language study. The level of student self-confidence in his/her listening comprehension skill was measured by pretesting and posttesting with a short attitude questionnaire. The three methods of instruction were presented once a week for a six-week period with a sample of 146 college students enrolled in nine sections of French. Results suggest a need for replication with a longer and more intense period of investigation, perhaps a semester in length. Data indicated a need for effective methods of developing skills in listening comprehension. Some indication that the video method may promote greater confidence in listening comprehension abilities was shown. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188444

VIDEO, AUDIO, AND READING INSTRUCTIONAL PRESENTATIONS OF SIX FRENCH LANGUAGE SCRIPTS: AN EVALUATION OF A LISTENING COMPREHENSION STUDY

Helen F. Durio and Cheryl A. Kildow

SR-79-5 May 1979

This report is one of a series of evaluations performed by the staff of the Measurement and Evaluation Center at the request of faculty members awarded grants for the improvement of undergraduate instruction at The University of Texas at Austin. The grants were made by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs during academic years 1977-1978 and 1978-1979.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
H. Paul Kelley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL010938

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION CENTER
The University of Texas at Austin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Methodology	
Sample	2
Instrumentation	3
Procedure	4
Research Design	5
Data Analysis	5
Results	5
Discussion	9
Recommendations	10
Tables	12
Appendix A	43

VIDEO, AUDIO, AND READING INSTRUCTIONAL PRESENTATIONS OF SIX FRENCH LANGUAGE SCRIPTS: AN EVALUATION OF A LISTENING COMPREHENSION STUDY

Helen F. Durio and Cheryl A. Kildow

This report presents a summary of an evaluation study assessing the effectiveness of three types of instructional presentations and two sequenced exposures to six French listening comprehension lessons. The development of six listening comprehension scripts to accompany video and audio presentations was supported by a grant for the improvement of undergraduate instruction awarded in 1978 through the Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs to Dr. Bernice S. Melvin, a faculty member in the Department of French and Italian. The Measurement and Evaluation Center (MEC) of The University of Texas at Austin served as the external evaluator of the project.

The use of audio taped lessons employing foreign language speakers to foster development of listening comprehension skills in students of foreign languages is well established, although recordings have been found more effective with beginning students than with students at an intermediate level of instruction. In this study, seeing as well as hearing the foreign speaker was hypothesized to be of even greater significance to student comprehension because of the importance of facial and body language cues in the understanding of a foreign speaker's message. It was also thought that any foreknowledge of the speaker's message through reading materials would be likely to interfere with student attentiveness to the speaker and, therefore, lessen the influence of visual or audio presentations.

The sharpening of listening skills in order to comprehend foreign speakers in nonlaboratory situations is a desirable objective for the student of any foreign language. Because it is unlikely that students will be presented with written content prior to a real life exposure to a foreign speaker, it seems reasonable to assume that the laboratory method of instruction should approximate reality as closely as possible. Thus, it was hypothe-

sized that the reading of a written script after rather than before viewing a video presentation would be of greater value to listening comprehension. It was also felt that the level of self-confidence felt by a foreign language student in terms of his/her ability to understand the spoken language is an important instructional outcome. Thus, it was predicted that greater gains in listening comprehension self-confidence and achievement would be found in those students exposed to the video presentation prior to reading a script of the taped presentation.

These hypotheses were explored through comparison of three listening comprehension presentational modes: (a) video (a combination of audio and visual presentation of the script materials by a native speaker of French), (b) audio (a taped recording of the script materials by a native French speaker), and (c) reading (the presentation of the written script only). Two sequencing approaches were used for the written scripts that accompanied the video and audio presentational modes: (a) scripts were given to students before viewing or hearing tapes and (b) scripts were given to students after viewing or hearing the tapes. In the reading presentational mode, the script was read by students; no exposure was provided to video or audio presentation.

The criterion measure of achievement was listening comprehension skill as demonstrated on the College Placement Test of French Listening Comprehension, a standardized achievement test using tapes appropriate for students with two to four years of language study.

The level of student self-confidence in his/her listening comprehension skill was measured by pretesting and posttesting of a short attitude questionnaire developed by Dr. Helen F. Durio, MEC staff member.

Methodology

Sample

For purposes of this study, a sample of 146 students enrolled in nine sections of French 312K at U.T. Austin were assigned to five presentational mode and script sequencing instructional conditions. Students were assigned to different sections of French 312K initially through general registration

procedures; there is no reason to believe that students differed significantly because of such assignment. The nine sections of French 312K were taught by six different instructors; the sections differed in enrollment. The nine sections of French 312K were randomly assigned to presentational mode and sequencing conditions within the constraints of combining sections into five groups for the purpose of matching numbers of students and balancing instructors across condition. Attrition and cancellation of two other French classes caused shifting enrollment during the course of the project; this unfortunately affected the equalization of the numbers of students in each of the five presentational mode and script sequencing conditions.

Instrumentation

Achievement Measures: Two comparable forms of the French Listening Comprehension Test were used in pretesting and posttesting of listening comprehension skills after six weeks. The College Placement Test in French Listening Comprehension is one of a series of tests administered by the Educational Testing Service for the College Entrance Examination Board. The College Board reports a reliability of .88 for this test; internal consistency for this sample of students was .80 on the pretest and .77 on the posttest.

Attitude Measure: A five-point Likert-type scale was used for the first eight items on the questionnaire, which was designed to measure level of self-confidence in student ability to comprehend a speaker of French. The eight scaled items employed a response continuum of "never, rarely, sometimes, usually, and always". Items were stated in both positive and negative terms. A weight of 1 was given to the negative response continuum and a weight of 5 to the positive response end; thus, a higher score was always reflective of the more positive attitude. These eight items were summed for each student to obtain a total score for self-confidence in listening comprehension. The last two items used comparative rankings and a simple "yes/no" format, respectively, for student responses. These two items on the attitude measure were analyzed separately since they were not in a Likert-type format; results are reported independently of the summative scaled score analyses.

The questionnaire was administered prior to beginning the presentational mode and script sequencing instructional approaches and at the end of six weeks after completion of the instructional approaches. The questionnaire is contained in the appendix. The measure was found to have very good reliability as indicated by an internal consistency alpha coefficient of .92 on the pretest and .95 on the posttest. An alpha coefficient of .70 is considered adequate for attitude measures (Cronbach, 1951).

Background Information: At the time of pretesting achievement and attitudes, six questions were asked students about their past experiences with the study of foreign languages.

Procedure

The six scripts used for the three presentational modes (video, audio, and reading) are available from the Department of French and Italian at U.T. Austin. The six scripts were developed by Dr. Melvin. Both the video and audio presentations were developed by the French language laboratory from these scripts. The audio portions of the presentations were identical in that the same native speaker was used by the language laboratory for the video presentation of a script, and the accompanying voice track was adapted for the audio presentation of that script.

One day a week for six weeks, one of the five instructional conditions in this study was used in each of the French 312K sections. Remaining class days each week were the same for all conditions. The pattern of instruction in both video and audio presentational modes for the sequence in which the script was given prior to viewing or hearing a tape was (a) to give a French script to students and then (b) to play the accompanying video or audio tape for them one time in its entirety without instructor comment. The same tape would then be played again, but it would be stopped halfway through for discussion and instructor comments. The tape would then be played a third time, after which more intensive instructor comment and discussion would take place. Three repetitions of each audio and video tape were also carried out in the sequencing condition that provided the written French script to students after exposure to audio and video tapes.

Research Design

A 3 x 2 repeated measures design and a 2 x 2 x 2 repeated measures design utilizing analyses of variance statistical procedures were used in assessing listening comprehension achievement and attitudinal feelings of self-confidence. The 3 x 2 design consisted of three levels of presentational mode (video, audio, and reading) and two levels for time of testing (pretesting and posttesting after six weeks). Presentational mode was a between-subjects factor, and time of testing was a within-subject factor in the design. The 2 x 2 x 2 design consisted of two levels of presentational mode (video and audio), two levels of script sequencing (before viewing or hearing tape and after viewing or hearing tape), and two levels for the time of testing factor (pretesting and posttesting after six weeks). Presentational mode and script sequencing were between-subject factors, while time of testing was a within-subjects factor in this design.

Data Analysis

Analysis of variance statistical procedures, summative scoring of scaled items on the attitude measure, and internal consistency techniques to assess reliability were carried out through computer programs from the PRIME library (Veldman, 1978). Frequency distributions for all variables were analyzed through programs in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences library (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1975).

Results

Tables 1-4 present a summary of responses to six questions relating to foreign language experiences that students were asked to answer at the time of the pretest administration. The response distributions are broken down by the three instructional presentation groups (video, audio, and reading). Means and standard deviations were computed for items 3 and 6, as responses were in an interval format. The responses of the three groups are quite similar. All three groups rated reading a foreign language as the skill they found the easiest to master. The video group ranked speaking as the more difficult skill, while the reading group rated listening as more difficult, and the audio group rated speaking and listening as equally difficult. These differences were not found sufficiently significant to assume students differed greatly in their perception of foreign language difficulty.

however, nor did students differ in the level of grades received in their last French language course.

The individual responses to the first eight items of the student attitude survey are reported in Tables 5-12. Both pretest and posttest results are summarized for the three groups (video, audio, and reading). Means and standard deviations were also computed for the total response of each group at each time of testing. A 3 x 2 analysis of variance was performed on each item (Tables 13-20). The first factor was instructional presentation condition (video, audio, and reading), and the second factor was time of testing (pre vs. post). As can be seen in Tables 13-20, the means obtained when the analysis of variance procedure was employed differ somewhat from reported means in Tables 5-12, which were obtained for the total number of responses for each group at each time of testing. In Tables 13-20, the analysis of variance procedure is performed only for students with complete data (a pretest score and a posttest score). Statistically significant differences were obtained for the main effect of time of testing on item 1 in Table 13, which pertained to feelings of competency in understanding French. The posttest mean item score was significantly greater than the pretest mean item score for all three groups. There was also a significant interaction between time of test and condition. Mean item scores for the video and reading groups went up on posttesting, while the posttest score for the audio group decreased slightly. The relatively large mean increase on this item from pretest to posttest within the reading group accounts for this statistically significant interaction. However, the increase from pretest to posttest may not be related directly to the perceived value of the reading instruction. Regardless of the particular teaching method employed, it seems possible that six weeks in a language class might have the effect of increasing feelings of competence in the ability to understand the language.

A nearly significant difference ($p<.06$) was found between the three groups on item six (Table 18). The audio group reported the most difficulty with listening to the French language, while the reading group reported the least difficulty. These responses reflect some shift of opinion when compared to the ranking of difficulties in the background information question.

Thus, interpretations of responses are difficult to make. What can be concluded, however, is that listening is perceived as a difficult skill to develop. All three groups obtained item means of less than 3.00, which would indicate that listening is thought to be difficult by the majority of students. The item means for the audio and reading groups dropped from pretesting to posttesting, while the mean of the video group rose slightly. None of these changes were statistically significant, but it might be interpreted as reflecting a trend toward the video group's development of greater ease in the presence of foreign speakers. The reading group showed the greatest decrement in self-confidence, which is also supportive of this trend.

Overall attitude scores were computed by obtaining a total score for the first eight items for individuals in each of three groups (Tables 21 and 22). Mean total scores were then analyzed through analysis of variance procedures. A 3 x 2 factorial design was utilized with the three presentations (video, audio, and reading) as the three levels of the first factor and time of testing (pre vs. post) as the two levels of the second factor.

This analysis revealed a nearly significant difference ($p<.09$) between pretest and posttest scores, with the posttest score somewhat lower than the pretest score (Table 21). A highly significant ($p<.004$) interaction effect occurred between condition and time of testing. In this analysis, both the overall attitude scores for the video and audio groups increased, while the overall attitude score for the reading group dropped 7.18 points. This rather large drop in mean score accounts for the significant difference obtained for time of test and suggests strongly that in the development of listening self-confidence, video and audio presentation were more effective than reading alone.

This same 2 x 2 x 2 design was also used in an analysis of variance with total attitude score as the criterion measure. Table 22 is a summary of the results of this analysis. No significant differences were found.

Table 23 reports the results of the ranking item (item 9) on the attitude questionnaire. This item compared student learning preferences for

hearing and seeing a French speaker, reading a French passage, and translating an English passage into French. Both the frequencies and percentages of response are reported for each instructional group (video, audio, and reading) on both the pretest and posttest. At the time of the pretest, the video and reading groups preferred an opportunity to view a speaker while listening to French being spoken, while the audio group preferred reading a French text. The use of audio alone appeared to be the least preferred by all three groups. At the time of the posttest, the audio and reading groups preferred hearing and seeing French speakers, while the video group slightly preferred reading a French text over hearing and seeing a speaker. The use of audio alone was again the least preferred by all three groups. However, none of these changes in preference are statistically significant.

The results of the responses to the last item on the attitude survey are presented in Table 24. This item reflects the degree of interest in continuing the study of French for the three instructional groups (video, audio, and reading) on both the pretest and posttest. Very little change is reflected on this item. Shifts in response appear to occur mainly from the "maybe" category to either the "yes" or "no" categories.

Table 25 summarizes the analysis of variance results for the scaled achievement scores. This analysis utilized a 3 x 2 factorial design. The three instructional groups (video, audio, and reading) were the three levels of the first factor, and time (pre vs. post) was the second factor. This analysis revealed no statistically significant differences in achievement.

Two sequences of script presentation within the video and audio groups were also investigated in this study (Table 26). In one condition, the script was given to the students before the video or audio tape was presented. In the other condition, the order of presentation was reversed, with the audio or videotape presented first, followed by the script. The scaled achievement scores were analyzed by a 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance to ascertain any difference in achievement associated with order of script presentation. Factors were instructional presentation (video vs. audio), script sequence (script first vs. script second), and time of test (pre

vs. post). The results of this analysis presented in Table 26 reveal no significant differences.

Discussion

The lack of statistically significant findings to support the hypothesis of this study is disappointing but rather understandable. It is quite difficult to produce achievement changes over the course of one semester with even the most intensive instructional program. This study was performed in its entirety during one six-week period with only one day a week given to instructional presentation distinctions. The three methods of instruction (video, audio, and reading) were presented once a week for the six week period. This brief period was not sufficient for influencing changes in achievement and attitudes by the time of posttest administration. The study was well designed and based on sound learning principles and deserves rightfully to be replicated with longer periods of differential instruction among video, audio, and reading groups.

The fact that positive gains in overall attitude scores were obtained by the audio and video groups, while the mean attitude score dropped for the reading group, indicates that reading alone was not sufficient to increase student self-confidence in listening comprehension skills. This finding, coupled with the finding that most students preferred both seeing and hearing a person speaking French to simply hearing the speaker, suggests that the video approach may be the most viable. Mean scores of the reading group on both achievement and attitude measures dropped substantially from pretest to posttest, while there was some increase on attitude and less achievement decrement from pretest to posttest for the video and audio groups. Although none of these changes were statistically significant, they support the belief that audio and video instructional methods can enhance a student's feelings of competence in listening comprehension.

Nevertheless, the audio method of learning was consistently ranked as least preferred by students. This suggests support for the video method. It is usually easier to understand a speaker when he or she can be viewed, because gesture and facial expression are a part of communication.

Students reported that reading French was the easiest skill to master. This response is understandable in that the individual student can read at his or her own pace, and reading is usually a major component of foreign language instruction. Students may be more comfortable, therefore, with this traditional medium of instruction. Because audio and video methods are not used as commonly as reading, students undoubtedly feel less competent in listening comprehension. More exposure to French speakers in the classroom seems likely to increase student feelings of competence in listening comprehension and ability to perform on tests of this skill.

The efficacy of any one script sequencing approach is less clear. While the principal investigator's premise appears intuitively valid with regard to possible interference from a written script that precedes taped audio or video presentations, any demonstration of this interference may require a somewhat different research methodology and criterion measure. The pretesting and posttesting of achievement and attitudes were confounded with other variables so as to lessen the impact from script sequencing. As noted in the investigator's original proposal, this exploration into the effects of script sequencing was a preliminary study to guide other research into the effect of foreknowledge of material on the formation of listening comprehension strategies. It is hoped this study can continue. Further research into this topic appears necessary before any conclusions can be drawn about the efficacy of script sequencing, but findings do warrant further study.

Recommendations

The results of this evaluation strongly suggest that this study should be replicated with a longer and more intense intervention period. A semester-long study of each of the methods would provide a more adequate length of time for the expected effects to be obtained.

Informal feedback from the instructors in this study reveals that students in the video condition did display more enthusiasm during the discussions than did those in the other conditions. Further research might incorporate formal measures of both instructor and student reaction to the

methods themselves (e.g., perceived helpfulness, technical quality, desire for further exposure to the method, etc.).

Although the hypotheses of this study were not supported by statistically significant results, the data do indicate a need for effective methods of developing skills in listening comprehension. The data also suggest that the video method may promote greater confidence in listening comprehension abilities among students. The results strongly suggest that the teaching methods investigated in this study merit greater in-depth study, and the principal investigator is to be congratulated for a well conceived and insightful approach to the problem of developing listening comprehension skills in study of a foreign language.

References

Cronbach, L.J. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 1951, 16, 297-334.

Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K. & Bent, D.H. SPSS: statistical package for the social sciences, Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Veldman, D.J. The prime system: computer programs for statistical analysis. Austin, Texas: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1978.

Table 1

Distribution of Responses to Background Information Questions on Foreign Language Experience of Three Groups of Students: Video, Audio, and Reading (N = 146)

Items 1 & 2. In addition to English, which other languages do you speak with some fluency? (The combined items gave students a total of two choices.)

Instructional Groups	None		French		German		Italian		Portu-guese		Russian		Spanish		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Choice 1																
Video (N=68)	19	27.9	40	58.8	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	11.8	0	0.0
Audio (N=44)	19	43.2	22	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.5	1	2.3
Reading (N=34)	7	20.6	20	58.8	2	5.9	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.8	1	2.9
Choice 2																
Video (N=68)	50	73.5	8	11.8	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	10.3	2	2.9
Audio (N=44)	39	88.6	3	6.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	1	2.3
Reading (N=34)	29	85.3	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.9	2	5.9

Table 2

Distribution of Responses to Background Information Questions on Foreign Language Experience of Three Groups of Students: Video, Audio, and Reading (N = 146)

Item 3. How would you rate your ability as a learner of foreign languages?

Instructional Group	1 Very Poor		2 Poor		3 Fair		4 Good		5 Excellent		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Video	0	0.0	3	4.4	27	39.7	29	42.6	9	13.2	68	100	3.65	.77
Audio	0	0.0	2	4.5	14	31.8	25	56.8	3	6.8	44	100	3.66	.68
Reading	0	0.0	1	2.9	17	50.0	14	41.2	2	5.9	34	100	3.50	.66

Table 3

Distribution of Responses to Background Information Questions on Foreign Language Experience of Three Groups of Students: Video, Audio, and Reading (N = 146)

Item 4. Which skill do you find the easiest?
Item 5. Which skill do you find the most difficult?

Instructional Group	Speaking		Listening		Reading		Writing		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Item 4										
Video	13	19.1	7	10.3	37	54.4	11	16.2	68	100.0
Audio	4	9.1	8	18.2	25	56.8	7	15.9	44	100.0
Reading	3	8.8	5	14.7	22	64.7	4	11.8	34	100.0
Item 5										
Video	32	47.1	21	30.9	5	7.4	10	14.7	68	100.0
Audio	15	34.1	15	34.1	5	11.4	9	20.5	44	100.0
Reading	6	17.6	16	47.1	3	8.8	8	23.5	33	97.0

Table 4

Distribution of Responses to Background Information Questions on Foreign Language Experience of Three Groups of Students: Video, Audio, and Reading (N = 146)

Item 6. What grade did you receive in your last (i.e., most recent) French course?

Instructional Group	0 F		1 D		2 C		3 B		4 A		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Video	0	0.0	2	2.9	6	8.8	24	35.3	36	52.9	68	100	3.38	.77
Audio	0	0.0	1	2.3	5	11.6	16	37.2	21	48.8	43	100	3.33	.77
Reading	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	16.1	13	41.9	13	41.9	31	100	3.26	.73

Table 5

Distribution of Responses, Means, Standard Deviations for Pre- and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension For Three Instructional Presentation Groups

Item 1. I feel very competent in my ability to understand the French language.

Group	1 Never		2 Rarely		3 Sometimes		4 Usually		5 Always		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Pretest (N = 131)														
Video	0	0.0	15	25.4	31	52.5	13	22.0	0	0.0	59	99.9*	2.97	.69
Audio	0	0.0	9	23.7	21	55.3	8	21.1	0	0.0	38	100.1*	2.97	.68
Reading	1	2.9	6	17.6	18	52.9	8	23.5	1	2.9	34	100.0	3.06	.81
Posttest (N = 126)														
Video	1	1.7	11	18.3	31	51.7	17	28.3	0	0.0	60	100.0	3.07	.73
Audio	0	0.0	10	24.4	24	58.5	7	17.1	0	0.0	41	100.0	2.93	.65
Reading	0	0.0	2	8.0	14	56.0	9	36.0	0	0.0	25	100.0	3.28	.61

* This figure differs from 100.0% because of rounding error.

Table 6

Distribution of Responses, Means, Standard Deviations for Pre- and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension For Three Instructional Presentation Groups

Item 2. I enjoy listening to the sounds of French being spoken.

Group	1 Never		2 Rarely		3 Sometimes		4 Usually		5 Always		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Pretest														
Video	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	15.3	26	44.1	24	40.7	59	100.0	4.25	.71
Audio	0	0.0	3	7.7	5	12.8	14	35.9	17	43.6	39	100.0	4.15	.93
Reading	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.8	13	38.2	18	52.9	34	100.0	4.44	.66
Posttest														
Video	0	0.0	2	3.3	9	15.0	22	36.7	27	45.0	60	100.0	4.23	.83
Audio	1	2.4	0	0.0	7	17.1	19	46.3	14	34.1	41	100.0	4.10	.86
Reading	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.0	12	48.0	11	44.0	25	100.0	4.36	.64

Table 7

Distribution of Responses, Means, Standard Deviations for Pre- and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension For Three Instructional Presentation Groups

Item 3. I feel confused when hearing French being spoken.

Group	1 Always		2 Usually		3 Sometimes		4 Rarely		5 Never		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Pretest														
Video	1	1.7	21	35.6	36	61.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	59	100.0	2.63	.55
Audio	1	2.6	18	46.2	18	46.2	2	5.1	0	0.0	39	100.0	2.54	.64
Reading	1	2.9	8	23.5	21	61.8	4	11.8	0	0.0	34	100.0	2.82	.67
Posttest														
Video	2	3.3	18	30.0	38	63.3	2	.3	0	0.0	60	100.0	2.57	.60
Audio	0	0.0	21	51.2	18	43.9	2	4.9	0	0.0	41	100.0	2.54	.60
Reading	0	0.0	6	24.0	17	68.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	25	100.0	2.88	.67

Table 8

Distribution of Responses, Means, Standard Deviations for Pre- and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension For Three Instructional Presentation Groups

Item 4. French speakers usually talk too rapidly for me to understand what has been said.

Group	1 Always		2 Usually		3 Sometimes		4 Rarely		5 Never		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Pretest														
Video	5	8.5	39	66.1	15	25.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	59	100.0	2.17	.56
Audio	7	17.9	24	61.5	8	20.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	39	100.0	2.03	.63
Reading	3	8.8	20	58.8	11	32.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	34	100.0	2.24	.61
Posttest														
Video	6	10.0	39	65.0	14	23.3	1	1.7	0	0.0	60	100.0	2.17	.62
Audio	2	4.9	33	80.5	6	14.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	41	100.0	2.10	.44
Reading	2	8.0	13	52.0	10	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	25	100.0	2.32	.63

Table 9

Distribution of Responses, Means, Standard Deviations for Pre- and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension For Three Instructional Presentation Groups

Item 5. It helps my understanding to see the person when listening to French being spoken.

Group	1 Never		2 Rarely		3 Sometimes		4 Usually		5 Always		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Pretest														
Video	1	1.7	3	5.1	11	18.6	19	32.2	25	42.4	59	100.0	4.09	.99
Audio	1	2.6	0	0.0	5	12.8	16	41.0	17	43.6	39	100.0	4.23	.87
Reading	2	5.9	2	5.9	2	5.9	18	52.9	10	29.4	34	100.0	3.94	1.07
Posttest														
Video	2	3.3	5	8.3	10	16.7	20	33.3	23	38.3	60	100.0	3.95	1.10
Audio	0	0.0	1	2.5	4	10.0	16	40.0	19	47.5	40	100.0	4.33	.76
Reading	0	0.0	1	4.0	7	28.0	12	48.0	5	20.0	25	100.0	3.84	.80

Table 10

Distribution of Responses, Means, Standard Deviations for Pre- and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension For Three Instructional Presentation Groups

Item 6. Listening to French is much more difficult for me than reading French.

Group	1 Always		2 Usually		3 Sometimes		4 Rarely		5 Never		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Pretest														
Video	23	39.0	25	42.4	8	13.6	3	5.1	0	0.0	59	100.0	1.85	.85
Audio	16	41.0	15	38.5	8	20.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	39	100.0	1.80	.77
Reading	7	20.6	11	32.4	12	35.3	3	8.8	1	2.9	34	100.0	2.41	1.01
Posttest														
Video	28	46.7	18	30.0	8	13.3	4	6.7	2	3.3	60	100.0	1.90	1.09
Audio	19	46.3	16	39.0	5	12.2	0	0.0	1	2.4	41	100.0	1.73	.87
Reading	9	36.0	9	36.0	3	12.0	4	16.0	0	0.0	25	100.0	2.08	1.08

Table 11

Distribution of Responses, Means, Standard Deviations for Pre- and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension For Three Instructional Presentation Groups

Item 7. I like to be exposed to French speaking persons.

Group	1 Never		2 Rarely		3 Sometimes		4 Usually		5 Always		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Pretest														
Video	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	25.4	24	40.7	20	33.9	59	100.0	4.09	.77
Audio	1	2.6	1	2.6	8	20.5	18	46.2	11	28.2	39	100.0	3.95	.92
Reading	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	17.6	18	52.9	10	29.4	34	100.0	4.12	.69
Posttest														
Video	0	0.0	1	1.7	12	20.0	20	33.3	27	45.0	60	100.0	4.22	.83
Audio	1	2.4	1	2.4	7	17.1	21	51.2	11	26.8	41	100.0	3.98	.88
Reading	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	16.0	11	44.0	10	40.0	25	100.0	4.24	.72

Table 12

Distribution of Responses, Means, Standard Deviations for Pre- and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension For Three Instructional Presentation Groups

Item 8. Listening comprehension in French is less important to me than speaking French.

Group	1 Always		2 Usually		3 Sometimes		4 Rarely		5 Never		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Pretest														
Video	0	0.0	7	11.9	12	20.3	21	35.6	19	32.2	59	100.0	3.88	1.00
Audio	0	0.0	3	7.9	11	28.9	13	34.2	11	28.9	38	100.0	3.84	.95
Reading	0	0.0	1	3.1	8	25.0	15	46.9	8	25.0	32	100.0	3.94	.80
Posttest														
Video	0	0.0	3	5.1	12	20.3	27	45.8	17	28.8	59	100.0	3.98	.84
Audio	0	0.0	4	10.0	12	30.0	15	37.5	9	22.5	40	100.0	3.73	.93
Reading	0	0.0	3	12.5	6	25.0	9	37.5	6	25.0	24	100.0	3.75	.99

Table 13

Analysis of Variance Source Table for Pretest and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension for Three Instructional Groups

Item 1. I feel very competent in my ability to understand the French language.

Source	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	p
Instruction				.60	2	.30	.39	.68
Video	51	3.01						
Audio	35	3.00						
Reading	25	3.12						
Time				.74	1	.74	4.22	.04
Pretest	111	2.98						
Posttest	111	3.10						
Instruction by Time				1.22	2	.61	3.49	.03
Video Pretest	51	2.96	.69					
Video Posttest	51	3.06	.73					
Audio Pretest	35	3.03	.66					
Audio Posttest	35	2.97	.66					
Reading Pretest	25	2.96	.73					
Reading Posttest	25	3.28	.61					
Error/Between				83.77	108	.76		
Error/Within				18.92	108	.18		

Table 14

Analysis of Variance Source Table for Pretest and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension for Three Instructional Groups

Item 2. I enjoy listening to the sounds of French being spoken.

Source	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	p
Instruction				2.55	2	1.28	1.12	.33
Video	51	4.21						
Audio	36	4.11						
Reading	25	4.38						
Time				.08	1	.08	.38	.55
Pretest	112	4.25						
Posttest	112	4.21						
Instruction by Time				.01	2	.005	.02	.97
Video Pretest	51	4.22	.73					
Video Posttest	51	4.19	.87					
Audio Pretest	36	4.14	.96					
Audio Posttest	36	4.08	.87					
Reading Pretest	25	4.40	.71					
Reading Posttest	25	4.36	.64					
Error/Between				123.57	109	1.13		
Error/Within				21.92	109	.20		

Table 15

Analysis of Variance Source Table for Pretest and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension for Three Instructional Groups

Item 3. I feel confused when hearing French being spoken.

Source	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	p
Instruction				2.09	2	1.05	1.84	.16
Video	51	2.65						
Audio	36	2.56						
Reading	25	2.80						
Time				.19	1	.19	1.02	.32
Pretest	112	2.64						
Posttest	112	2.70						
Instruction by Time				.41	2	.20	1.08	.34
Video Pretest	51	2.61	.57					
Video Posttest	51	2.69	.62					
Audio Pretest	36	2.58	.60					
Audio Posttest	36	2.53	.61					
Reading Pretest	25	2.72	.68					
Reading Posttest	25	2.88	.67					
Error/Between				62.07	109	.57		
Error/Within				20.47	109	.19		

Table 16

Analysis of Variance Source Table for Pretest and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension for Three Instructional Groups

Item 4. French speakers usually talk too rapidly for me to understand what has been said.

Source	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	P
Instruction				.96	2	.48	1.04	.36
Video	51	2.15						
Audio	36	2.10						
Reading	25	2.26						
Time				.09	1	.09	.42	.52
Pretest	112	2.15						
Posttest	112	2.19						
Instruction by Time				.17	2	.09	.39	.68
Video Pretest	51	2.16	.54					
Video Posttest	51	2.14	.63					
Audio Pretest	36	2.08	.60					
Audio Posttest	36	2.11	.46					
Reading Pretest	25	2.20	.65					
Reading Posttest	25	2.32	.63					
Error/Between				50.23	109	.46		
Error/Within				24.30	109	.22		

Table 17

Analysis of Variance Source Table for Pretest and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension for Three Instructional Groups

Item 5. It helps my understanding to see the person when listening to French being spoken.

Source	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	P
Instruction				6.60	2	3.30	2.34	.10
Video	51	4.01						
Audio	36	4.29						
Reading	25	3.86						
Time				.07	1	.07	.16	.69
Pretest	112	4.07						
Posttest	112	4.04						
Instruction by Time				.14	2	.07	.16	.85
Video Pretest	51	4.06	1.01					
Video Posttest	51	3.96	1.11					
Audio Pretest	36	4.28	.85					
Audio Posttest	36	4.31	.79					
Reading Pretest	25	3.88	1.01					
Reading Posttest	25	3.84	.80					
Error/Between				153.39	109	1.41		
Error/Within				46.22	109	.42		

Table 19

Analysis of Variance Source Table for Pretest and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension for Three Instructional Groups

Item 7. I like to be exposed to French speaking persons.

Source	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	P
Instruction				.89	2	.45	.39	.68
Video	51	4.10						
Audio	36	4.00						
Reading	25	4.16						
Time				.33	1	.33	1.24	.27
Pretest	112	4.05						
Posttest	112	4.13						
Instruction by Time				.22	2	.11	.42	.66
Video Pretest	51	4.06	.81					
Video Posttest	51	4.14	.85					
Audio Pretest	36	4.00	.93					
Audio Posttest	36	4.00	.93					
Reading Pretest	25	4.08	.70					
Reading Posttest	25	4.24	.72					
Error/Between				124.74	109	1.14		
Error/Within				28.52	109	.26		

Table 20

Analysis of Variance Source Table for Pretest and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension for Three Instructional Groups

Item 8. Listening comprehension in French is less important to me than speaking French.

Source	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	p
Instruction				.46	2	.23	.18	.84
Video	50	3.87						
Audio	34	3.78						
Reading	23	3.89						
Time				.08	1	.08	.18	.68
Pretest	107	3.87						
Posttest	107	3.83						
Instruction by Time				.49	2	.24	.56	.58
Video Pretest	50	3.82	1.00					
Video Posttest	50	3.92	.83					
Audio Pretest	34	3.82	.97					
Audio Posttest	34	3.74	.93					
Reading Pretest	23	3.96	.82					
Reading Posttest	23	3.83	.94					
Error/Between				131.96	104	1.27		
Error/Within				44.92	104	.43		

Table 21

Analysis of Various Source Table for Pretest and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension: Total Attitude Scores of Three Groups (N = 146)

Source	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	P
Instruction				6.59	2	3.29	.05	.96
Video	68	22.80						
Audio	44	23.00						
Reading	34	23.15						
Time				236.05	1	236.05	2.89	.09
Pretest	146	24.00						
Posttest	146	22.02						
Instruction by Time				949.09	2	474.55	5.81	.004
Video Pretest	68	22.50	9.27					
Video Posttest	68	23.04	9.31					
Audio Pretest	44	22.50	8.67					
Audio Posttest	44	23.50	7.03					
Reading Pretest	34	26.74	2.79					
Reading Posttest	34	19.56	12.22					
Error/Instruction				10426.95	143	79.92		
Error/Time of Test				11679.85	143	81.68		

Table 22

Analysis of Variance Source Table for Pretest and Posttest Measures of Student Self-Confidence in Listening Comprehension: Total Attitude Scores for Two Groups With Two Levels of Script Sequencing (N=112)

	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	p
Instruction				10.01	1	10.01	.14	.71
Video	68	22.75						
Audio	44	23.19						
Script Sequencing				100.41	1	100.41	1.37	.24
Script before	51	23.67						
Script after	61	22.27						
Time of Test				15.70	1	15.70	.19	.67
Pretest	112	22.69						
Posttest	112	23.25						
Instruction by Script Sequencing				1.21	1	1.21	.02	.89
Video/Script before	35	23.37						
Video/Script after	33	22.12						
Audio/Script before	16	23.97						
Audio/Script after	28	22.41						
Instruction by Time of Test				.03	1	.03	.0004	.98
Video/Pretest	68	22.46						
Video/Posttest	68	23.04						
Audio/Pretest	44	22.92						
Audio/Posttest	14	23.46						

Table 22 (cont.)

Source	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	P
Script Sequencing by Time of Test				74.09	1	74.09	.90	.35
Script before/Pretest	51	24.00						
Script before/Posttest	51	23.34						
Script after/Pretest	61	21.39						
Script after/Posttest	61	23.15						
Instruction by Script Sequencing by Time of Test				13.38	1	13.38	.16	.69
Video/Script before/Pretest	35	23.43	8.96					
Video/Script before/Posttest	35	23.31	9.43					
Video/Script after/Pretest	33	21.48	9.62					
Video/Script after/Posttest	33	22.76	9.32					
Audio/Script before/Pretest	16	24.56	2.25					
Audio/Script before/Posttest	16	23.38	6.64					
Audio/Script after/Pretest	28	21.29	10.62					
Audio/Script after/Posttest	28	23.54	7.37					
Error/Between				7888.90	108	73.05		
Error/Within				8853.89	108	81.98		

Table 23

Distributions of Four Ranked Preferences for Three Instructional Presentation Groups on Pretest/Posttest Measures of Student Attitude
(N = 107)

Item 9. In studying French, I learn more when I
(a) hear and see French speakers.

	1		2		3		4		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Pretest										
Video	29	56.9	10	19.6	9	17.6	3	5.9	51	100.0
Audio	13	41.9	6	19.4	9	29.0	3	9.7	31	100.0
Reading	14	56.0	5	20.0	4	16.0	2	8.0	25	100.0
Posttest										
Video	18	35.3	8	15.7	22	43.1	3	5.9	51	100.0
Audio	12	38.7	7	22.6	10	32.3	2	6.5	31	100.1*
Reading	11	44.0	5	20.0	9	36.0	0	0.0	25	100.0

*This figure differs from 100.0% because of rounding error.

Item 9. In studying French, I learn more when I
(b) hear voices speaking French.

	1		2		3		4		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Pretest										
Video	2	3.9	15	29.4	14	27.5	20	39.2	51	100.0
Audio	1	3.2	3	9.7	13	41.9	14	45.2	31	100.0
Reading	4	16.0	9	36.0	6	24.0	6	24.0	25	100.0
Posttest										
Video	3	5.9	9	17.6	9	17.6	30	58.8	51	99.9*
Audio	0	0.0	5	16.1	6	19.4	20	64.5	31	100.0
Reading	1	4.0	7	28.0	5	20.0	12	48.0	25	100.0

*This figure differs from 100.0% because of rounding error.

Table 23 (cont.)

Distributions of Four Ranked Preferences for Three Instructional Presentation Groups on Pretest/Posttest Measures of Student Attitude
(N = 107)

Item 9. In studying French, I learn more when I
(c) read a French text.

	1		2		3		4		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Pretest										
Video	14	27.5	14	27.5	14	27.5	9	17.6	51	100.1*
Audio	14	45.2	12	38.7	3	9.7	2	6.5	31	100.1*
Reading	4	16.0	7	28.0	4	16.0	10	40.0	25	100.0
Posttest										
Video	20	39.2	15	29.4	10	19.6	6	11.8	51	100.0
Audio	11	35.5	9	29.0	7	22.6	4	12.9	31	100.0
Reading	8	32.0	5	20.0	5	20.0	7	28.0	25	100.0

*This figure differs from 100.0% because of rounding error.

Item 9. In studying French, I learn more when I
(d) translate an English passage into French.

	1		2		3		4		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Pretest										
Video	6	11.8	12	23.5	14	27.5	19	37.3	51	100.1*
Audio	3	9.7	10	32.3	6	19.4	12	38.7	31	100.1*
Reading	5	20.0	4	16.0	10	40.0	6	24.0	25	100.0
Posttest										
Video	10	19.6	19	37.3	10	19.6	12	23.5	51	100.0
Audio	8	25.8	10	32.3	8	25.8	5	16.1	31	100.0
Reading	5	20.0	8	32.0	6	24.0	6	24.0	25	100.0

*This figure differs from 100.0% because of rounding error.

Table 24

Distribution of Responses on Desire for Continued French Study
For Three Instructional Presentation Groups
On Pretest/Posttest Measures
Of Student Attitudes
(N = 107)

Item 10. Do you plan to take a French course beyond the second year?

Instructional Group	Yes		No		Maybe		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Pretest								
Video	15	29.4	13	25.5	23	45.1	51	100.0
Audio	12	38.7	5	16.1	14	45.2	31	100.0
Reading	8	32.0	5	20.0	12	48.0	25	100.0
Posttest								
Video	15	29.4	15	29.4	21	41.2	51	100.0
Audio	14	45.2	6	19.4	11	35.5	31	100.0
Reading	6	25.0	6	25.0	12	50.0	24	100.0

Table 25

Analysis of Variance Source Table for Pretest/Posttest Measures of Student Achievement for Three Instruction Groups (N = 122)

Source	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	p
Instruction				4159.08	2	2079.54	.28	.76
Video	58	494.0						
Audio	41	502.0						
Reading	23	492.0						
Time				1435.76	1	1435.77	1.16	.28
Pretest	122	499.0						
Posttest	122	494.0						
Instruction by Time				1295.81	2	647.90	.52	.60
Video Pretest	58	496.0	65.0					
Video Posttest	58	492.0	67.0					
Audio Pretest	41	502.0	60.0					
Audio Posttest	41	502.0	64.0					
Reading Pretest	23	498.0	73.0					
Reading Posttest	23	486.0	68.0					
Error/Instruction				878828.50	119	7385.11		
Error/Time of Test				147517.45	119	1239.64		

Table 26

Analysis of Variance Source Table for Pretest/Posttest Measures of Student Achievement for Two Instruction Groups with Two Script Sequences (N = 122)

	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	p
Instruction				3589.24	1	3589.24	.50	.49
Video	68	494.0						
Audio	44	503.0						
Script Sequencing				951.41	1	951.41	.13	.72
Script before	51	501.0						
Script after	61	496.0						
Time of Test				213.21	1	213.21	.17	.68
Pretest	112	500.0						
Posttest	112	498.0						
Instruction by Script Sequencing				279.32	1	279.32	.04	.84
Video/Script before	35	495.0						
Video/Script after	33	493.0						
Audio/Script before	16	506.0						
Audio/Script after	28	500.0						
Instruction by Time of Test				186.67	1	186.67	.15	.70
Video/Pretest	68	496.0						
Video/Posttest	68	492.0						
Audio/Pretest	44	503.0						
Audio/Posttest	44	503.0						

Table 26 (cont.)

Source	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	P
Script Sequencing by Time of Test				49.29	1	49.29	.04	.84
Script before/Pretest	51	502.0						
Script before/Posttest	51	500.0						
Script after/Pretest	61	498.0						
Script after/Posttest	61	495.0						
Instruction by Script Sequencing by Time of Test				356.78	1	356.78	.29	.60
Video/Script before/Pretest	35	496.0	77.0					
Video/Script before/Posttest	35	495.0	82.0					
Video/Script after/Pretest	33	497.0	52.0					
Video/Script after/Posttest	33	489.0	49.0					
Audio/Script before/Pretest	16	508.0	53.0					
Audio/Script before/Posttest	16	506.0	57.0					
Audio/Script after/Pretest	28	499.0	65.0					
Audio/Script after/Posttest	28	500.0	69.0					
Error/Between				686784.56	95	7229.31		
Error/Within				117476.08	95	1236.59		

APPENDIX

SS Number
Name
Teacher
Hour

French 312K

STUDENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Please circle the number that corresponds to your opinion in responding to the following statements.

1. I feel very competent in my ability to understand the French language.

1	2	3	4	5
never	rarely	sometimes	usually	always

2. I enjoy listening to the sounds of French being spoken.

1	2	3	4	5
never	rarely	sometimes	usually	always

3. I feel confused when hearing French being spoken.

5	4	3	2	1
never	rarely	sometimes	usually	always

4. French speakers usually talk too rapidly for me to understand what has been said.

5	4	3	2	1
never	rarely	sometimes	usually	always

5. It helps my understanding to see the person when listening to French being spoken.

1	2	3	4	5
never	rarely	sometimes	usually	always

6. Listening to French is much more difficult for me than reading French.

5	4	3	2	1
never	rarely	sometimes	usually	always

7. I like to be exposed to French speaking persons.

1	2	3	4	5
never	rarely	sometimes	usually	always

8. Listening comprehension in French is less important to me than speaking French.

5	4	3	2	1
never	rarely	sometimes	usually	always

9. Please rank in order of importance (1,2,3,4)

In studying French, I learn more when I
___hear and see French speakers.
___hear voices speaking French.
___read a French text.
___translate an English passage into French.

10. Do you plan to take a French course beyond the second year?
Yes____ No___ Maybe____

Please write any comments and suggestions you might have concerning these items or the course below.